

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached sheet of drawing includes a new figure, Fig. 3. In Fig. 3, step limitations recited in the claims are illustrated. No new matter has been presented, since Fig. 3 is fully supported by the original disclosure of the present application.

Attachment: one (1) new drawing sheet

### Remarks

In response to the Examiner's requirement for election/restriction contained on p. 3-4 of the Office Action, Applicant elects Group I directed to claims 11-25.

Claims 11 and 22 are pending in the present application after cancellation of claims 12-21 and 23-30 in this Amendment.

In the "Remark" section on p. 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that "applicant wants to claim when to make a triggering, or when to make a trigger decision," and "[t]his decision for 'when' is not patentable," Applicant notes that the claimed subject of amended claim 11 is directed to how the triggering decision is made, not merely when. In addition, in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, Applicant has deleted the numerical references in the amended claims.

### Drawing Objection

In response to the Examiner's drawing objection, Applicant is submitting a new Fig. 3 which illustrates an example method for triggering at least one restraint system of a motor vehicle. The Specification has been amended to incorporate corresponding description for new Fig. 3. No new matter has been introduced since new Fig. 3 and the accompanying description are fully supported by the original disclosure of the present application, including the originally-filed claims.

### Claim Objections

The Examiner has contended that steps S2, S3, S4 and S5 as recited in original claim 11 are "undefined," and therefore these steps should be elaborated by incorporating the limitations of claims 12, 13, 15 and 18. In this regard, Applicant notes that there is simply no logical or legal basis for the Examiner's contention, particularly since the meaning of each step S2, S3, S4 or S5 is clear and fully explained in the Specification. In any case, the Examiner has not provided any reason why steps S2, S3, S4 and S5 as recited in original claim 11 are "undefined."

Although Applicant completely disagrees with the Examiner's contention that steps S2, S3, S4 and S5 as recited in original claim 11 are "undefined," Applicant has

amended claim 11 to incorporate the limitations of claims 12, 13, 15 and 18 purely for the purpose of expediting prosecution of the present application. In view of the amendments to claim 11, Applicant submits that the claim objections have been overcome.

#### Claim Rejection

Claim 11 has been rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. To the extent the indefiniteness is based on the failure to incorporate the limitations recited in claims 12, 13, 15 and 18, amended claim 11 overcomes this alleged deficiency by incorporating the limitations recited in claims 12, 13, 15 and 18. In addition, with respect to the antecedent basis for the term "this data," this term has been deleted from amended claim 11. Accordingly, the indefiniteness rejection of claim 11 has been overcome.

#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 11 and its dependent claim 22 are in allowable condition. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

 (P. No. 36,197)

Dated: March 22, 2010

By: SONG LEE for Gerard Messina

Gerard A. Messina

(Reg. No. 35,952)

One Broadway, NY, NY 10004

(212) 425-7200

**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**